



Patent
Attorney's Docket No. 033048-059

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of)	MAIL STOP AF
Harold Poskanzer et al.)	Group Art Unit: 2144
Application No.: 09/838,142)	Examiner: TAM T PHAN
Filed: April 20, 2001)	Confirmation No.: 9523
For: AUTOMATED PROVISIONING OF)	
COMPUTING NETWORKS USING)	
A NETWORK DATABASE DATA)	
MODEL)	

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated June 17, 2005 Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of the claims. The withdrawal of the previous grounds of rejection is noted with appreciation.

Claims 22-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102, on the grounds that they were considered to be anticipated by the newly-cited Suzuki et al patent (US 6,816,964). For the reasons presented below, it is respectfully submitted that the Suzuki patent does not anticipate the subject matter of the pending claims.

Claim 22 recites a method for executing commands on a remote device. The first step of the claimed method is "creating a queue containing a sequence of commands to be executed on the remote device." The Office Action states that the Suzuki patent discloses this step, with reference to its Abstract, Reference No. 11 in Figure 1, Figures 5 and 7, and column 6, lines 60-65. The Office Action appears to be referring to the script file 11 disclosed in the Suzuki patent. It is respectfully submitted that a script file is not the same as a queue. For example, Barron's